

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

By the present Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1-4, 11 and 24. Applicant also hereby adds claims 26-27 to more fully cover various implementations of the invention.

Applicant also hereby cancels claims 9 and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-19 and 21-27 are all the claims pending in the Application, with claims 1 and 13 being in independent form. Claims 1-6 and 8-25 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

The Examiner has indicated that the drawings filed on February 20, 2004 have been accepted.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 alleging that the final line of claim 1 should state “said display means.” Applicant has amended claim 1, as set forth above, to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Examiner has also objected to claims 9 and 20. Without conceding the merits of the Examiner’s objections, Applicant has hereby canceled claims 9 and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner’s objections with respect to these claims are now moot.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13, 15-22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin (U.S. 5,078,476), in view of Beard (U.S. 5,747,938), and further in view of Weindorf (U.S. 6,396,217). The Examiner has also rejected claims 2 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin, in view of Beard, further in view of Weindorf, and further in view of Kurzman (U.S. 5,057,977). Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 12 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shin, in view of Beard, further in view of Weindorf, and further in view of Hyman (U.S. 5,637,093). Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner acknowledges that Shin and Beard fail to teach or suggest the feature of a light which is external to the display, as claimed. However, the Examiner alleges that, although Weindorf is primarily drawn to a backlight display device for use in a vehicle dashboard, Weindorf suggests that a frontlit display may be implemented and alleges that, since a vehicle draws from a limited power supply (i.e., a battery), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the backlight controller taught by a combination of Shin and Beard to limit power consumption of the lighted displays of Weindorf.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Weindorf fails to provide any teaching or suggestion whatsoever that the frontlight taught therein is external to said display, as recited in claim 1. In fact, Weindorf teaches just the opposite—that the frontlight taught therein is an internal component of the display device 100. Column 4, lines 26-31.

The MPEP requires that the Examiner must give the claims of the present application their broadest reasonable interpretation. (MPEP §2111.01). One of ordinary skill in the art

would not have reasonably interpreted the recitations “a display means... wherein said lighting means is external to said display means” and “a display... wherein said lighting device is external to said display,” as recited in claims 1 and 13, respectively, to include a frontlight of a liquid crystal display panel, as taught in Weindorf. Indeed, such an interpretation would require that one of ordinary skill ignore the express teachings of Weindorf that the frontlight taught therein is an internal component of the display device 100. Thus, Applicant submits that the Examiner’s interpretation of the recitations of claims 1 and 13 is clearly not reasonable as required by MPEP §2111.01.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 13 are patentable over the cited references for *at least* these reasons. Further, Applicant submits the dependent claims 2-6, 8, 10-12, 14-19 and 21-25 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

V. New Claims

New claims 26-27 have been added and are fully supported by *at least* FIGS. 1-5 of the original specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 26-27 are patentable over the cited references *at least* by virtue of their dependency and by virtue of the recitations set forth therein.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/781,725

Attorney Docket No.: Q79639

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

Date: April 28, 2008